

REMARKS

The Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the substance of claim 2 therein. Claim 14 is amended to address the new 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

It is submitted that the above amendments would put the application in condition for allowance or materially reduce or simplify the issues for appeal. The amendments are made to direct the claims to the subject matter indicated in the Office Action to be allowable. Thus, they do not raise new issues or present new matter. Because the allowable subject matter was first indicated in the Final action, these amendments were not earlier presented. Accordingly, it is submitted that the requested amendments should be entered.

To the extent that the amendments avoid the prior art or for other reasons related to patentability, competitors are warned that the amendments are not intended to and do not limit the scope of equivalents which may be asserted on subject matter outside the literal scope of any patented claims but not anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art or otherwise unpatentable to applicants. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter disclosed in the application which has been canceled by any of the above amendments.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is believed to be rendered moot by the above amendment thereto since the objected to "glass" term is removed from the claim.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, §103 and for Obviousness-type Double Patenting

The rejections of claims 1, 3, 6-11 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102, as being anticipated, under 35 U.S.C. §103, as being obvious, and for obviousness-type double patenting over WO 98/03583 (Solms, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,065) are believed to be rendered moot by the above amendments. The Office Action indicated that the subject matter of claim 2 was allowable and

that claim 2, written in independent form, would be allowable. The amendment to claim 1 incorporates the substance of claim 2, thus, claim 1 is essentially previous claim 2 written in independent form. All of the other claims depend, ultimately, from claim 1. None of the rejections were directed against previous claim 2. Thus, it is believed that all the current claims are directed to the indicated allowable subject matter and the 35 U.S.C. §102, §103 and double patenting rejections should be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. But the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33,103
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: LEIF-0005

Date: November 13, 2006

JAS:blb

K:\LEIF5\amendment 11-13-06.doc